

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action made Final mailed October 30, 2007, is requested in view of the amendments above and the following remarks. Prior to this amendment, Claims 1-21 were pending and at issue in this application prior to this amendment. By this amendment, Claims 1 and 14 have been amended to distinguish over the cited prior art, and new claims 22 and 23 have been added. No new matter has been added.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-21 AS BEING ANTICIPATED

In the Office Action claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wallace et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,322,576 B1). In order to anticipate a claim under § 102, a single prior art reference must disclose, either expressly or inherently, each and every limitation of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection should be withdrawn because Wallace et al. does not disclose, either expressly or inherently, Applicants' claimed invention as amended herein.

Claims 1 and 14, as amended herein, recite that the first helical section has at least 10 complete loops. The 10 loop section of the present invention facilitates placement of the occlusive coil into a catheter because it provides a section which tends to maintain a columnar shape. In contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, Wallace et al. does not teach a first helical section having at least 10 complete loops. The Figure 23A of Wallace et al., relied on by the Examiner has at most 2 complete loops in its first helical section. This very small helical section can do little to maintain a columnar shape helpful to placing the coil into a tubular catheter.

Thus, claims 1 and 14 patentable distinguish over Wallace et al. Moreover, claims 2-13 and 15-24 depend from claims 1 or 14, or an intervening claim, and are not anticipated by Wallace et al. for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 14.

In addition, new claims 23 and 24 recite that the secondary shape further comprises a third helical section having at least 10 complete loops, wherein said second section is between said first section and said second section. The third helical section further facilitates the placement and advancement of the vaso-occlusive coil into a catheter. Wallace et al. does not disclose a vaso-occlusive coil having such a structure. Thus, claims 23 and 24 are not anticipate by Wallace et al. for at least these additional reasons.

CONCLUSION

Any claim amendments which are not specifically discussed in the above remarks are not made for reasons of patentability, do not affect the scope of the claims, and it is respectfully submitted that the claims satisfy the statutory requirements for patentability without the entry of such amendments. These amendments have only been made to increase claim readability, to improve grammar, or to reduce the time and effort required of those in the art to clearly understand the scope of the claim language.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the Examiner's rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, allowance is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner feels that a telephone interview could expedite resolution of any remaining issues, the examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the phone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
VISTA IP LAW GROUP LLP

Dated: January 25, 2008

By: James K. Sakaguchi/
James K. Sakaguchi
Reg. No. 41,285

JKS:jks
VISTA IP LAW GROUP LLP
2040 Main Street, 9th Floor
Irvine, CA 92614
Telephone: 760-803-5967
Facsimile: 949-625-8955